

REMARKS

Claims 1-9 currently remain in the application. Claims 1, 3, 4 and 9 are herein amended.

The formal drawings submitted earlier have been accepted in Paragraph 3 of the Official Letter but applicant since discovered an error in Fig. 1 in that words "CPU UNIT" which relate to numeral 10 as can be clearly understood from the specification appear closer to the system bus 17. It is therefore requested that a further replacement of the drawing sheet comprising Fig. 1 as indicated on the accompanying photocopy be approved.

Claims 1-3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 as being anticipated by Itoh and claims 4-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 over Itoh in view of Wilburn. At least in part in view of the Examiner's reasons for the rejection. independent claims 1, 3, 4 and 9 are herein amended.


The amendment herein effected includes adding the limitation that the programming tool mentioned in these claims is an external instrument connected to the CPU unit through a communication interface, not a part of the CPU unit. This limitation is clearly supported not only by Fig. 1 but also by word in the specification (page 8, lines 17-24, for example) and hence believed enterable.

This limitation is believed to make these claims allowable because the Examiner considered throughout the Office Action that Itoh's "program controlling microcomputer 1" as an equivalent of the programming tool appearing in the claims of the present application. As Itoh shows in its Fig. 1, for example, Itoh's program controlling microcomputer 1 is a constituent of the CPU module 15, not external to it and hence not requiring a communication interface to connect it thereto.

It is believed that this additional limitation changes the characteristics of these claims completely, affecting the characteristics of many of the functions and steps defining these claims because using an external component to carry out a certain process and executing a similar process internally are quite different. One does not suggest and is not obvious in view of the other. In summary, it is believed that the present amendment introducing a new limitation regarding the external nature of the tool obviates the Examiner's rejection. It is

therefore requested that the Examiner reads the claims under this new light and come to allow the application as now stands.

Respectfully submitted,


Keiichi Nishimura
Registration No. 29,093

January 26, 2006
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP
500 12th Street, Suite 200
Oakland, California 94607
Telephone: (510) 663-1100
Telefax: (510) 663-0920

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:

Fig. 1 is amended as shown in red on the accompanying photocopy by moving the position of words "CPU UNIT" closer to numeral 10. Formal drawing sheet incorporating the change will be submitted at a later date.